

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON  
PORTLAND DIVISION

**GUY MICHAEL**

Plaintiff,

v.

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,**

Defendant.

No. 2:11-cv-00713-SU

OPINION AND ORDER

**MOSMAN, J.,**

On November 15, 2011, Magistrate Judge Sullivan issued her Findings and Recommendation (“F&R”) [18] in the above-captioned case recommending that plaintiff Guy Michael’s motion to transfer [7] be granted in part and denied in part, and that plaintiff’s state law claims be dismissed without prejudice. No objections were filed.

**DISCUSSION**

The magistrate judge makes only recommendations to the court, to which any party may file written objections. The court is not bound by the recommendations of the magistrate judge, but retains responsibility for making the final determination. The court is generally required to make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). However, the

court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the F&R to which no objections are addressed. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003). While the level of scrutiny under which I am required to review the F&R depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case, I am free to accept, reject, or modify any part of the F&R. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).

Upon review, I agree with Judge Sullivan's recommendation and I ADOPT the F&R [18] as my own opinion.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 8th day of December, 2011.

/s/ Michael W. Mosman  
MICHAEL W. MOSMAN  
United States District Court